



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/615,888	07/08/2003	Terence Gerard Daly	10407-631	9852
30076 7590 01/03/2007 STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP 1330 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20036			EXAMINER CROSS, ALAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3714	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/03/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/615,888

Applicant(s)

DALY, TERENCE GERARD

Examiner

Alan Cross

Art Unit

3714

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 August 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,6-16 and 18-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,6-16 and 18-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8, 10-12, 15,16,18-23, 25-27, 30 and 31 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Munoz, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/024313 A1 in view of Singer et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,604,740 B1. Munoz discloses a gaming method for playing a reel selection slot machine. A plurality of reels within a display window are spun. The plurality of reels each display one or more game symbols (See Munoz Fig. 3). A subset of the reels is selected for use in determining a game outcome. The non-selected reels are removed from a player's view within the display reel. The selected reels are consolidated in the display window so as to be rearranged so that the selected reels are adjacent to one another. It is then determined if the selected reels produce a winning game outcome and a prize is awarded if a winning game outcome is achieved (See Munoz Fig. 4; ¶0022, ¶0028-¶0030) [claims 1,

Art Unit: 3714

16, 30]. The spinning of the reels are stopped after the consolidating of the selected reels within the display window (See Munoz ¶¶0004, ¶¶0028) [claims 1, 16, 31]. The consolidating of the selected reels within the display window includes juxtapositioning the selected reels to eliminate any non-contiguous positioning of the selected reels produced by the removal of the non-selected reels (See Munoz Figs. 4-6) [claims 20, 30]. The selection of the subset of reels for use in determining a game outcome is player controlled (See Munoz ¶¶0028) [claims 6, 21]. The selection of the subset of reels for use in determining a game outcome is computer controlled (See Munoz ¶¶0031) [claims 7, 22]. The plurality of reels are video representations of physical reels (See Fig 3) [claims 8, 23]. The gaming method is used as a bonus game in conjunction with an underlying primary game (See Munoz ¶¶0033) [claims 10, 25]. A winning outcome in the bonus game results in a prize that is added to a prize won in the underlying primary game or a multiplying prize won in the underlying primary game (See Munoz ¶¶0005) [claims 11, 12, 26, 27]. For example, if a player gets a 2 x multiplier, this “doubles” the primary prize, i.e. it adds the primary prize to itself. The gaming method may be used as a primary game (See Munoz ¶¶0004) [claims 15, 30].

Munoz discloses stopping the spinning of the reels after consolidating the selected reels within the display window. At the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to stop the spinning of the selected reels before consolidating the selected reels or before removing the non-selected reels from a player's view within the display window because Applicant has not disclosed that the time the reels are stopped provides an advantage,

Art Unit: 3714

is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Munoz's gaming device and applicant's invention to perform equally well with stopping the spinning of the reels at any time because no matter when the reels are stopped, the player still gets to view the game outcome.

Therefore, it would have been prima facie obvious to modify Munoz to obtain the invention as specified in claims 3, 4, 18 and 19 because such a modification would have been considered a mere design consideration which fails to patentably distinguish over the prior art of Munoz.

Munoz lacks in disclosing selecting a subset of the reels while they are currently spinning. Singer et al. teaches of a slot machine in which a player may select paylines or an amount bet per line before or after the reels of a slot machine are spinning (See Singer col. 8 lines 17-20). Consequently, whether a player selects elements, i.e. paylines, amount bet per line, or reels to form an outcome, before or after the reels of a slot machine are spun is also an obvious design choice. At the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to select a subset of symbols while they are currently spinning because Applicant has not disclosed that selection of currently spinning reels provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with selection of non-spinning reels because the selection of the reels that make up the game outcome are still selected before the outcome is determined. Therefore, just as Singer teaches that a player may select certain elements either

Art Unit: 3714

before or after the reels are spinning, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select a subset of reels of Munoz as the reels are currently spinning because the outcome of the game still has not been determined when the selection is made.

Claims 9 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munoz in view of Singer in further view of the Price is Right game "Squeeze Play". Munoz lacks in disclosing randomly changing the position of the selected reels after removing the non-selected reels. In the Price is Right game "Squeeze Play" a contestant, randomly chooses one number out of three numbers to be removed from the price of a prize. Once that number is removed, the remaining numbers randomly change positions, i.e. based on the contestant's random selection of the removed number, and the remaining numbers remain and are compared to the price of the prize and it is determined if the contestant wins (See "Squeeze Play") [claims 9, 24]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to randomly change the position of the selected reels after removing the non-selected reels in the game of Munoz. By changing the reel positions, the player can clearly see which reels are still involved in the play of the game and can concentrate on these reels instead of reels not involved in the game outcome.

Claims 13, 14, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munoz in view of Singer in further view of Fier, U.S. Patent No. 6,126,542. Munoz lacks in disclosing that the bonus game reduces or loses a prize in the underlying primary game. Fier teaches of a gaming device and describes in the background of the invention how it is common throughout the art that when a non-

Art Unit: 3714

winning game outcome occurs in the bonus game, there is the possibility of losing or reducing a prize won in the underlying primary game (See Fier 2 lines 16-26) [claims 13, 14, 28, 29]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the player risk their primary game award when in order to play the bonus game. By having the player risk their primary award, the casino can recoup the primary award if the player loses the bonus game. Therefore, by having the player risk their primary award the casino can make money in order to pay off the bonus games with winning outcomes.

Response to Amendment

It has been noted that claims 1, have been amended and claims 2,5 and 17 have been canceled. The 112 rejections have been withdrawn in response to the claims being canceled.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed December 15, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Munoz does not disclose consolidating the reels. The Examiner disagrees and notes that Munoz discloses 5 reels in which 2 may be inactive and are removed from play by a variety of methods. Therefore, the gaming machine can then have only 3 reels, which have been consolidated from 5 reels. Consolidating the reels is just aesthetic, where the outcome of the reels in use will have the same

Art Unit: 3714

wining combination whether they were consolidated or spaces were between them. One of ordinary skill in the art would see that removing unused parts of the game display in a video game machine would be obvious so that a user could focus and understand what was truly affecting them.

Applicant further argues that the combination does not teach selecting the reel while the reel is currently spinning, the examiner disagrees. Singer teaches where a player may select pay lines and amount bet while the reels are spinning. It is an obvious design choice to allow a user to select the reel to modify or spin, many machines allow a user to stop a spinning reel, where by their stopping the reel the user is selecting the reel, were it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill to select a subset or reel while the reels are currently spinning because the outcome of the game still has not been determined when the selection is made

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 3714

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alan Cross whose telephone number is 571-272-5529. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Xuan Thai can be reached on 571-272-7147. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ARC 571-272-5529


XUAN M. THAI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TC3700